

7

LUC-319/Abrams 3-1-4-5

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 20 was objected to.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 20 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0176404 A1 issued to Girard dated November 28, 2002 in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2006/0023696 issued to Berger dated February 2, 2006 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,608,832 issued to Forslow on August 19, 2003.

Claims 6-12, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Das et al., "A Call Admission and Control Scheme for Quality-of-Service (QoS) Provisioning in Next Generation Wireless Networks" in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2006/0023696 issued to Berger dated February 2, 2006 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,608,832 issued to Forslow on August 19, 2003.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0176404 A1 issued to Girard dated November 28, 2002 in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2006/0023696 issued to Berger dated February 2, 2006, in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,608,832 issued to Forslow on August 19, 2003, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,618,384 B1 issued to Elliott on September 9, 2003.

Claims 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al., "A Call Admission and Control Scheme for Quality-of-Service (QoS) Provisioning in Next Generation Wireless Networks" in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2006/0023696 issued to Berger dated February 2, 2006, in view of U.S. Patent

Number 6,608,832 issued to Forslow on August 19, 2003, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,618,384 B1 issued to Elliott on September 9, 2003.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al., "A Call Admission and Control Scheme for Quality-of-Service (QoS) Provisioning in Next Generation Wireless Networks" in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2006/0023696 issued to Berger dated February 2, 2006, in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,608,832 issued to Forslow on August 19, 2003, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0176404 A1 issued to Girard dated November 28, 2002.

Rejection Under Girard, Berger and Forslow

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Girard in view of Berger and further in view of Forslow.

This ground of rejection is avoided for the following reason.

Claim 20, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable if rewritten in independent form and which was previously dependent from claim 1, has been canceled. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include therein the limitation from claim 20. Claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"wherein call control for the multi-media call is handled by a single point of control, and wherein said single point of control reallocates packet-switched resources and circuit-switched resources for the multi-media call, and wherein said single point of control waits for circuit-switched resources to become available while resources are changed to packet-switched resources, and wherein said single point of control allocates packet-switched resources and circuit-switched resources independently for different parts of the multi-media call, and wherein said single point of control blocks new calls while resources are changed from circuit-switched resources to packet-switched resources"

The Examiner admits that the cited references do not teach "wherein said single point of control blocks new calls while resources are changed from circuit-switched resources to packet-switched resources", as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Therefore the combination of Girard with Berger and Forslow does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-3 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 6 and 14 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the combination of Girard with Berger and Forslow. For example, claims 6 and 14 recite, "wherein said single point of control blocks new calls while resources are changed from circuit-switched resources to packet-switched resources". The combination of Girard with Berger and Forslow does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 6 and 14 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Das, Berger, Forslow, Girard, Elliott

Claims 6-12, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Das in view of Forslow.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girard in view of Forslow, and further in view of Elliott.

Claims 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das in view of Forslow, and further in view of Elliott.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das in view of Forslow on August 19, 2003, and further in view of Girard.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Girard with Berger and Forslow being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein said single point of control blocks new calls while resources are changed from circuit-switched resources to packet-switched resources" as recited in applicants' independent claims 1, 6 and 14, the combinations of a) Das with Berger and Forslow, b) Girard with Berger, Forslow and Elliott, c) Das with Berger, Forslow and Elliott, and d) Das with Berger, Forslow and Girard do not supply these missing elements. Thus, these combinations do not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

10


LUC-319/Abrams 3-1-4-5

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, she is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: June 2, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382